DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 652 SP 028 666

AUTHOR Johnston, John M.; Kay, Richard
TITLE Institutions of Higher Education Involvement in Beginning Teacher Induction: The State of Current Practice.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Arlington, VA, February 12-15, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; College Faculty; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Schools of Education; Social Support Groups; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on findings from a survey on the involvement of institutions of higher education (IHE) in beginning teacher induction efforts. Five teacher induction program goals are briefly outlined as a context for presenting and discussing the survey data. Responses to the survey questionnaire were received from 300 member institutions (42%) of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). The questions were designed to identify institutions involved in beginning teacher induction activities and key issues concerning teacher induction activities within the institutional context. The following areas were covered by the questionnaire: (1) school, college or department of education (SCDE) programs or activities designed to assist beginning teachers; (2) SCDE plans to initiate activities in the next two years; (3) common beginning teacher induction activities; (4) diverse approaches to induction; (5) faculty involved in induction activies other than SCDE faculty; (6) formal agreements for induction with local school systems; (7) accounting for induction activities in faculty work load; and (8) faculty participation in induction activities. Issues and realities affecting IHE involvement in teacher induction are discussed, and suggestions are made for more productive involvement in future teacher induction activities. A copy of the survey questionnaire is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279652

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INVOLVEMENT IN BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION: THE STATE OF CURRENT PRACTICE

John M. Johnston
Memphis State University

Richard Kay
Brigham Young University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. M. Johnston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Research Paper Presented at the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
February 12-14, 1987 - Washington, DC

SP 028 666

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INVOLVEMENT IN BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION: THE STATE OF CURRENT PRACTICE

John M. Johnston
Memphis State University

Richard Kay
Brigham Young University

The primary purpose of this paper is to report findings from a survey of institutions' of higher education (IHE) involvement in beginning teacher induction efforts*. Five teacher induction program goals are briefly outlined as a context for presenting and discussing the survey data. The paper concludes with consideration of factors affecting IHE participation, and suggested areas of involvement.

Institutions of higher education and their teacher education units share an important responsibility for the professional induction of beginning teachers. This responsibility is shared with experienced teachers, school building administrators, school district administrators, school boards, state departments of education, teacher organizations and local communities. The proper role of institutions of higher education in teacher induction efforts, like the roles of these other groups, should be closely linked to the goals for induction programs.

---

*A more comprehensive discussion of this study may be found in: Johnston, J.M. & Kay, R. (1987). The role of institutions of higher education in professional teacher induction. In D. M. Brooks (Ed). Teacher induction: A new beginning. Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

Goals of Teacher Induction

Recent attention to teacher induction has fueled consideration of realistic and appropriate goals for teacher induction programs (Fox & Singletary, 1986; Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes & Paulissen, 1986; Huling-Austin, 1986; Johnston, 1985; McDonald, 1980; Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986; Zeichner, 1983). Goal specification is a necessary first step in determining how institutions of higher education might be most usefully involved in the teacher induction process. Five broad goals of teacher induction program can be identified: (a) orientation, (b) psychological support, (c) acquisition and refinement of teaching skills, (d) retention, and (e) evaluation.

1. Orientation. One of the most commonly cited goals of beginning teacher induction programs is to integrate the beginning teacher into the professional and social fabric of the school, school district and neighborhood community which the school serves.

2. Psychological Support. A primary induction goal is to promote beginning teachers' professional self-esteem and sense of professional well-being. Also, recent evidence further argues for the goal of supporting the personal well-being of beginning teachers (Johnston, 1985; Zeichner, 1983).

3. Acquisition and Refinement of Teaching Skills. Goals in this category are heavily emphasized and supported in most induction programs (cf., Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986). These goals attend to general as well as site-specific teaching skills, knowledge and attitudes, with the aim of providing an orderly and personalized transition from preservice preparation to daily classroom teaching.

4. Retention. Perhaps the most central goal of induction programs is to increase the likelihood that competent, promising beginning teachers will continue in the teaching profession.

5. Assessment and Evaluation. One of the most hotly debated goals of beginning teacher induction pertains to assessment and evaluation of new teachers within the context of an induction program. In spite of logical arguments to the contrary, many induction programs fail to separate evaluation procedures from induction efforts.

Survey of IHE Involvement in Teacher Induction

The Association of Teacher Educator's National Commission on the Induction Process began its work by reviewing existing knowledge regarding four domains of teacher induction programs and activities: local schools, state school systems, professional organizations, and institutions of higher education. Given the almost total lack of information regarding current IHE involvement in beginning teacher induction programs, the present authors completed a brief survey designed to identify institutions and gather data regarding the general

nature of their invovlement. Further, basic information was collected regarding several key issues around IHE induction activities.

Sample and instrument. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) member institutions prepare approximatly 95% of all teachers certified in the United States each year. The AACTE membership represents a broad range of public, private, large and small colleges and universities. The total AACTE membership (N=716) comprised the sample population for the present survey. Responses were obtained from 300 (42%) AACTE member institutions representing Washington DC, Puerto Rico, and all states except Maine, North Dakota, and Vermont. Public and private institutions were represented, as were small colleges, universities and large land grant institutions.

The questionnaire (see appendix) contained eight questions designed to identify institutions involved in beginning teacher induction activities; and to address several key issues concerning teacher induction activities within the institutional context.

School, college or department of education (SCDE) programs or activities designed to assist beginning teachers. Responses to this item indicated that 55 (18%) institutions are presently in the planning stage, 63 (21%) have already implemented such programs or activities, and 27 (9%) are in the process of piloting new programs. Specific comments concerning the status of these programs were limited and gave very little information beyond a frequency count. Of those institutions that did comment, 16 stated that their programs had been developed in response to mandates from the respective State Departments of Education

and were controlled to some extent by the State. Four institutions reported that programs in their states seem to be under the control of the local school districts. Funding requests had been submitted by nine institutions who were awaiting approval to proceed with implementation of their programs. From the number of institutions reporting ongong programs it is apparant that induction is an emerging concern but still quite young in its development. The remaining 155 (52%) institutions reported that they did not have a program in existence, and thus responded to question 2.

SCDE plans to initiate activities in the next two years. Of the 155 institutions responding no to question 1, 71 (46%) indicated they did have plans for beginning an induction program of some type within the next two years. A total of seven institutions volunteered information about the nature of their plans and the moving forces behind them. Two institutions reported that their plans were contingent on a pending state mandate. A third institution stated that their plans were to make such induction activities available for any teachers interested in receiving help but participation would be strictly voluntary. If the responses from the 71 institutions responding to this question are at all representative of the trends in the profession, it does not appear as though induction is currently a major priority of the main body of teacher education institutions. Given the trend toward increased induction activities in school systems, and the legislative mandates in many states, this priority may change dramatically over the next few years however.

Common beginning teacher induction activities. The total number of institutions reporting involvement in each activity is indicated in Table 1. No attempt was made to assess the relative effectiveness of the activities at this time. The intent of this item was to obtain a frequency count of the number of institutions involved in each type of activity.

Table 1

114	Consulting with others about professional development activities for beginning teachers
99	Serving as a member of beginning teacher support teams
97	Conducting workshops targeted for beginning teachers
82	Internship/MAT/Alternative certification programs
81	Field supervision of beginning teachers
78	Training of local education district personnel to assist beginning teachers
62	Offering courses primarily designed for beginning teachers

Diverse approaches to induction. Respondants were requested to indicate beginning teacher support activities in which their SCDE was participating other than the examples given in the table above. The number of institutions indicating involvement in these activities suggests a good deal of variety in the way in which induction is handled by responding institutions. These additional activities and the number of reporting institutions are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

9	Seminars and informal gatherings for beginning teachers to get together and discuss with colleagues and peers
7	Alternative provisional certificate
6	Trained peer teachers to work with beginning teachers
5	Mentor teachers
4	Computer-based network and toll-free telephone assistance
3	Paid substitutes for beginning teachers while observing other teachers
2	Retired educators as support systems for beginning teachers

It is somewhat surprising that only five institutions reported using "mentors." The literature and activities at various professional association meetings suggest that Mentoring is in the mainstream of induction activities. Perhaps many of the institutions responding to the items in question 3 included mentoring under one of those items. It may be, for example, that IHE members of beginning teacher support teams, or those who engage in field supervision of beginning teachers consider themselves in a "mentor" role.

Faculty involved in induction activities other than SCDE faculty. In response to this item, 81 (39%) institutions indicated that additional faculty outside their institutions were involved in induction activities, while 127 (61%) indicated no additional faculty involvement. These numbers are a little confusing since only 145 institutions indicated that they currently had an induction program in the planning

stage, in the pilot stage or implemented. It may be that some institutions indicating that they had no induction program, also checked the question regarding faculty involvement other than SCDE faculty.

The other than SCDE faculty involved in induction activities included supervisors from content areas within the university, public school personnel from the same school where the first year teacher was employed, district level content area supervisors, and other selected faculty from the public schools.

Formal agreements for induction with local school systems. Sixty-nine (31%) institutions indicated the existence of such an agreement and 118 (54%) said they had no such agreement. Nineteen (9%) did indicate that a formal agreement did exist between their institutions and the State Department of Education. Another 14 institutions indicated an agreement with area schools including more than just one district.

Accounting for induction activities in faculty work load. The most commonly reported method for assigning work load was on an overload basis (43 institutions) followed closely by reduction of load in other areas (37 institutions). Extra pay was reported by 13 institutions and 6 institutions indicated that full-time faculty positions had been created to handle the induction activities. No mention was made by the institutions indicating overload assignments as to whether or not the overload was accompanied by extra compensation. The assumption made in preparing this report was that no extra compensation was given by these

institutions. It this assumption is correct, great difficulty in sustaining this effort over a long term would be predicted.

Faculty participation in induction activities. The most common basis for assigning faculty was on a voluntary basis by those interested in working in the program. This does tend to soften the concern stemming from overload assignments but only for the short term. If induction programs are going to be effective they must be self-sustaining and not totally dependent on the professional commitment of a few. The second most common method for making induction assignments was according to competence and ability. Ideally it would be the most competent and capable who would volunteer; this may or may not be reality. Other methods include assignment on the basis of teaching area and area where the demands by beginning teachers were the greatest. The basis for assigning faculty appear to be flexible according to the needs of the local programs.

Given the limitations inherent in survey research, the following picture emerges regarding IHE involvement in teacher induction programs. About half of the responding institutions are currently planning, piloting or engaged in induction activities. An additional 24% plan to initiate such activities in the next two years. The nature of IHE induction activities reported suggests that IHE faculty most frequently play a consulting role, though they also frequently engage in one-to-one service as members of beginning teacher support teams or field supervisers of beginning teachers. Less frequently IHE faculty engage in one-to-many group activities such as training of local education

district personnel to assist beginning teachers, or offering courses or workshops targeted primarily for beginning teachers. Almost 40% of IHE involve faculty outside the school, college or department of education. Though further analysis is necessary, one might speculate that a good number of these institutions are small liberal arts institutions which rely on content area faculty to support the teacher education activities. It appears that when institutions engage in teacher induction activities, they do so through a formal agreement with local school districts or the State Department of Education. In spite of such formal agreements, IHE faculty most commonly engage in induction program activites on an overload basis, though many faculty receive some reduction of load in other areas. Faculty interest appears to be the most common basis for assignment of faculty to induction activites.

Issues and Realities for IHE Involvement in Teacher Induction

In the present era of teacher education reform, an assertion being heard with increasing frequency is that teacher education institutions should extend their formal contact with beginning teachers through their initial years of teaching. Though prescriptions for the nature of such contact are often vague, it is usually understood that college professors will have some form of personal contact with beginning teachers, often stated in terms of "going out into the field."

Such prescriptions ignore the obvious reality that institutions of higher education and their schools, colleges and departments of education are outside the institutional structure of elementary and

secondary schools. The effect of this reality is that teacher educators have little input into the forms of institutional control which act to socialize beginning teachers. Unlike the direct or personal control exercised by the school principal or department head who supervises and monitors teachers' compliance with school rules and procedures, teacher educators have no such authority. Similarly, teacher educators are not a part of the bureaucratic control—the social structure and social relations embedded in the beginning teacher's workplace. Finally, teacher educators have no technical control over beginning teachers; they have no say in what or how teachers are expected to teach or in the evaluation of the extent to which these expectations are met. Zeichner (1983) effectively argues that technical control may be a particularly potent form of influence on the socialization of beginning teachers.

In planning effective involvement in induction activities, it must be recognized that IHE faculty may be paddling upstream in their efforts to socialize beginning teachers via individual field-based efforts. In order to optimize the effect of their involvement in teacher induction programs, IHE faculty need to carefully consider what goals they can most likely accomplish, and how their involvement can be most efficient.

A second issue concerns the mechanics of college and university institutional adaptation to greater faculty involvement in teacher induction activities. A field-based approach would represent an increase in a relatively labor-intensive form of teaching. At issue here is how work loads will be determined for faculty assigned to induction programs. Recent experience suggests that a clinical teaching

model may be necessary. Adopting such a model demands the support of the university central administration in the form of financial resources, computation of teaching loads, and evaluation of faculty productivity.

Failure to obtain central administration support may cause problems for higher education faculty who are expected to work in teacher induction programs or activities within public schools. Teacher educators, like other university faculty, are expected to offer instruction as part of their work responsibility. In addition, they are expected to engage in scholarship and service to their profession. They are held accountable for each of these three activities in annual evaluations which affect their salary, rank and tenure. Currently many teacher education faculty find themselves facing higher standards of performance in the area of scholarship, with no corresponding consideration for work requirements in the other two areas. IHE faculty who work in field based teacher induction programs may be at a considerable disadvantage with respect to evaluation of their job performance, unless institutional accomodations are made to compensate for the nature of field-based teaching and service activities. The stress resulting from such a disadvantage may result in frequent and unnecessary turnover of faculty involved in these induction activities.

A related issue concerns the level at which IHE faculty are involved in teacher induction programs. One position is that higher education faculty ought to observe and work directly with individual beginning teachers. If teacher educators are expected to provide

meaningful assistance with problems specific to a given beginning teacher's work situation, such a level of involvement is necessary. As noted above, institutions of higher education would be required to make modifications to accomodate this form of involvement by its teacher education faculty. Further, there is concern about the potency and effectiveness of this form of assistance by university personnel (Zeichner, 1983; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981).

An alternative position is that higher education faculty could have optimal effect by concentrating their involvement at a level once removed from one-to-one assistance in beginning teachers' classrooms. Recognizing that beginning teachers need individualized assistance, higher education faculty might be most effectively employed in the training and preparation of those individuals who actually do provide the one-to-one help to the beginner.

For example, given the trend in many induction programs to use mentor teachers (Johnston and James, 1986), higher education faculty might make best use of their time by cooperatively planning and implementing with local school systems, a program to train, monitor and evaluate mentor teachers. Instead of a one-to-one teaching model, higher education faculty would be employing the one-to-many model which is consistent with the current organizational and administrative structure of colleges and universities.

Toward More Productive IHE Involvement in Teacher Induction

The proposals offered below are based on several assumptions. First, that the initial years of teaching are a special time unlike any other phase in a teacher's career development, and that beginning teachers need thoughtfully planned and executed induction programs. Institutions of higher education must recognize that they are responsible for contributing to the cooperative effort to induct beginning teachers, and that they share this responsibility with a variety of other groups and agencies. It is also assumed that each of these agencies and groups are better suited to accomplish certain specific induction program goals than are other groups or agencies. Finally, the follwing proposals are based on the position that the most effective involvement of IHE faculty will be at the level in which one faculty member provides services in a one-to-many rather than in a one-to-one context.

1. Cooperate in orientation program design
2. Train community volunteers to work in orientation programs
3. Involve liberal arts faculty in planning specific orientation program components as they provide discipline based knowledge about school communities, local customs, neighborhood values, local history, geography, and community resources
4. Involve liberal arts faculty in delivering training for skills essential to cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity
5. Cooperate in planning and delivery of psychological support services for teacher induction programs

6. Train local school system personnel to deliver psychological support servies
7. Plan and deliver seminars, classes, workshops or support groups focused on acquisition and refinement of teaching skills
8. Cooperate in developing state and local guidelines for mentoring programs
9. Train local school personnel to be effective mentors of beginning teachers
10. Assist in design and execution of local and state wide evaluations of teacher induction efforts

REFERENCES

Fox, S. M. & Singletary, T. J. (1986). Deductions about supportive induction. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 12-15.

Hoffman, J. V., Edwards, S. A., O'Neal, S., Barnes, S. & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 16-21.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 2-5.

Johnston, J. M. (1985). Teacher induction: Problems, roles and guidelines. In P.J. Burke and R. G. Heideman (Eds.), Career-long teacher education (pp. 194-222).

Johnston, J. M. & James, T. L. Leadership and cooperation through mentoring: Rethinking roles in teacher education. Paper presented at the Summer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, Flagstaff, AZ, August, 1986.

Johnston, J. M. & Kay, R. (In Press, 1987). The role of institutions of higher education in professional teacher induction. In D. M. Brooks (Ed.) Teacher induction: A new beginning. Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

McDonald, F. J. (1980). The teaching internship and teacher induction. In C. C. Mackey, Jr. (Ed.), Assuring qualified educational personnel in the eighties (pp. 91-117). Proceedings of the annual convention of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (52nd), Boston, MA.

Varah, L. J., Theune, W. S., & Parker, L. (1986). Beginning teachers: Sink or swim? Journal of Teacher Education 37(1), 30-34.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of teachers. In G. Griffin and H. Hukill (Eds.), First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 240 109)

Zeichner, K. & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32, 7-11.

ATE Association of Teacher Educators
Suite ATE, 1900 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091 (703) 620-3110

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE INDUCTION PROCESS

Peggy Ishler, Chair
Director of Field Experiences
and Standards Compliance
318 Education Building
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402-0241

Robert Alley
College of Education
Wichita State University
Box 28
Wichita, KS 67208

Douglas M. Brooks
Center for Professional
Teacher Education
Box 19227
Arlington, TX 76019

Parmalee Hawk
School of Education
East Caroline University
Greenville, NC 27886

Leslie Huling-Austin
Research & Development Center
for Teacher Education
College of Education
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712-1288

John M. Johnston
Department of C & I
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152

Richard Kay
149B MCKB
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

Ralph Kester
Greenville College
East Maine Street
Greenville, IL 62246

Frank Lyman
5418 Killingworth Way
Columbia, MD 21044

Mary Marockie
Regional Education Service Agency
30 CG & P Road
Wheeling, WV 26003

Sandra Odell
Coordinator, Graduate Intern
and Teacher Induction Program
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Shirley Robards
Chair of Professional Education
University of Tulsa
600 South College, LH 202
Tulsa, OK 74104

John Smith
Director of Teacher Education
Goshen College
Goshen, Indiana 46526

Judy Willard
School of Education
Auburn University
Montgomery, AL 36193

Robert Houston
Executive Board Liaison
College of Education
466 Fairsler Hall
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77004

February 3, 1986

TO: School, College and Department of
Education Deans and Chairpersons

In 1985 Robert Houston, President of the Association of Teacher Educators, appointed a Commission on the Professional Induction Process. The Commission was charged with taking an indepth look at the entry year as to current practice, research findings, model programs, and professional recommendations on effective induction of teachers into the profession.

Now in its second year, the Commission is studying four components of the induction process in relation to four contexts of professional practice. The components include: a) rationale, need and context for induction; b) present knowledge--characteristics and designs of programs, implementation strategies, etc.; c) issues involved in planning and implementing induction efforts; and d) guidelines for future induction programs and activities. Each component is being examined in relation to four contexts: a) local districts, b) institutions of higher education, c) state departments of education, and d) professional organizations.

The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in the efforts of the ATE Commission on the Professional Induction Process. We are seeking information about the involvement of institutions of higher education in the induction of beginning teachers. Please see that the questions are answered; then mail the form by folding and securing it so that the postage paid address is visible. We are requesting that you return the completed form within two weeks of its receipt.

Information collected by the ATE Commission on Induction will be incorporated into a monograph to be completed by early Spring, 1987. We will greatly appreciate your professional consideration and participation in the work of our Commission.

Best Regards,

Peggy Ishler

Peggy Ishler
Chairperson

1. Does your School, College or Department of Education (SCDE) currently have a program or activities designed to assist beginning teachers:

(a) _____in the planning stage (b) _____in the pilot stage

(c) _____implemented (d) _____No

Comments:

2. If the answer to question 1 is no, does your SCDE have plans to initiate such activities in the next two years? _____YES _____NO

Comments:

3. Below are a few examples of common beginning teacher induction activities. Please check those activities in which your SCDE is involved.

_____Offering course(s) primarily designed for beginning teachers

_____Field supervision of beginning teachers

_____Consulting with others about professional development activities for beginning teachers

_____Training of local education district personnel to assist beginning teachers

_____Conducting workshops targeted for beginning teachers

_____Serve as members of beginning teacher support team

_____Internship/MAT/Alternative certification programs

4. If your SCDE is participating in beginning teacher support activities other than the examples listed in question 3, please list them below.

5. Are faculty other than SCDE faculty involved in induction activities?
_____YES _____NO

Comments:

6. Are your SCDE induction activities part of a formal agreement with local school systems? _____YES _____NO

Comments:

7. How does your institution account for induction activities in faculty work load?

8. On what basis are faculty assigned to participation in induction activities?

Name of Person completing form_____

Address_____

_____

_____

For return mail: Please refold so business reply postage is visible, then tape closed.